

1 HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT TACOMA

10 ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY,  
11 et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 TACOMA THERAPY, INC., et al.,

15 Defendants.

16 CASE NO. 13-CV-05214-RBL

17 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'  
18 MOTION TO STRIKE OR DISMISS  
19 COUNTERCLAIMS

20 [DKT # 64]

21 **I. Introduction**

22 THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff<sup>1</sup> Allstate's motion to strike or dismiss  
23 Defendant McLaughlin's Counterclaims. Defendants are Tacoma Therapy, Inc., Tacoma  
24 Rehabilitation, Inc., and the Law Office of McLaughlin & Associates, Inc. The individual  
owners of these entities and their spouses are also named in the suit. Plaintiffs are four related

---

25 <sup>1</sup> The Plaintiffs are separate Allstate-related entities. For clarity, this Order will reference  
26 them in the singular "Allstate," unless the context requires otherwise.

1 insurance companies. The Defendants have provided medical and legal services to Allstate's  
2 insureds. Allstate claims that the Defendants conspired to obtain insurance payments for medical  
3 services that were either not medically necessary or not actually performed. Wesley McLaughlin  
4 and his law firm counterclaimed, asserting claims for conspiracy, defamation, Washington  
5 Consumer Protection Act violations and tortious interference. McLaughlin alleges that Allstate  
6 committed all of these violations by filing this lawsuit. Allstate now seeks to strike or dismiss  
7 the counterclaims under Washington's Anti-SLAPP law or Fed. R. Civ. P. 12b(6). For the  
8 reasons stated below, Allstate's motion to strike is **DENIED**. Allstate's motion to dismiss the  
9 conspiracy, defamation or tortious interference counterclaims is **GRANTED**. Allstate's motion  
10 to dismiss the CPA claim is **DENIED**.

## 11                   **II.       Background**

12                   Allstate alleges that the Defendants used a referral scheme to commit insurance fraud. It  
13 claims that the provider Defendants overbilled Allstate's insureds and third-party claimants.  
14 Then, McLaughlin and his law firm submitted claims to Allstate and recovered payment for  
15 treatment that was not necessary or, in some cases, not provided at all.

16                   McLaughlin not only denies all of Allstate's allegations, he has counterclaimed alleging  
17 that by filing this lawsuit, Allstate has defamed him, conspired to defraud and extort him,  
18 violated the Washington Consumer Protection Act, and tortiously interfered with his business  
19 expectations. To be clear, all of McLaughlin's counterclaims are based solely on the fact that  
20 Allstate's filed this lawsuit.

21                   McLaughlin alleges that the multiple Allstate entities conspired to defraud and extort him  
22 and others who accept liens on insurance claims as payment. According to McLaughlin, Allstate  
23 filed this lawsuit and similar lawsuits around the country in an attempt to drive these providers  
24

1 out of business. He further alleges that Allstate's allegedly fraudulent litigation violates the  
 2 Washington Consumer Protection Act.

3 Allstate moves to dismiss or strike the counter claims, arguing that they are asserted in  
 4 retaliation for its original complaint. Allstate first claims that the suit is a SLAPP suit and subject  
 5 to a motion to strike under the Washington Anti- SLAPP law. In the alternative, Allstate argues  
 6 dismissal is warranted under Rule 12b(6) for failure to state a claim.

### 7 III. Discussion

#### 8 A. Washington Anti-SLAPP Law

9 Allstate claims that McLaughlin's counterclaims are barred by Washington's Anti-SLAPP  
 10 law. Specifically, Allstate claims that McLaughlin's counterclaims are retaliatory and an attempt  
 11 to silence Allstate's public participation. McLaughlin contends that the Anti-SLAPP law does  
 12 not apply because this is a private dispute, not an issue of public concern.

13 Strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPP suits) are suits filed in retaliation for  
 14 speaking out on an issue of public concern and are designed to silence the speaker. *Aronson v.*  
*Dog Eat Dog Films, Inc.*, 738 F.Supp.2d 1104, 1109 (2010).

16 [S]trategic lawsuits against public participation (or SLAPP suits) are “filed against  
 17 individuals or organizations on a substantive issue of some public interest or social  
 significance,” and “are designed to intimidate the exercise of First Amendment rights.”

18 *Id.* The party subject to the SLAPP suit can move to strike the SLAPP claim. R.C.W.  
 19 4.24.525(4).

20 (4)(a) A party may bring a special motion to strike any claim that is based on an action  
 21 involving public participation and petition, as defined in subsection (2) of this section.

22 *Id.* Actions involving public participation are in furtherance of free speech and connected to an  
 23 issue of public concern. *Id.* at (2)(e).

1                   (2) This section applies to any claim, however characterized, that is based on an action  
 2 involving public participation and petition. As used in this section, an “action involving  
 3 public participation and petition” includes:

4                   (e) Any other lawful conduct in furtherance of the exercise of the constitutional  
 5 right of free speech in connection with an issue of public concern, or in  
 6 furtherance of the exercise of the constitutional right of petition.

7                  *Id.* The key to protection under the Anti-SLAPP statute is a direct connection between the  
 8 actions of the party faced with a SLAPP suit and an issue of public concern; the balance of  
 9 power between the parties does not matter. *Aronson*, 738 F.Supp.2d at 1111.

10                 That Defendant may be considered a powerful business entity as compared with the  
 11 private party Plaintiff is of no import under the modern framework of the statute. Nor is it  
 12 critical that Plaintiff is not a public figure... a private individual satisfies this requirement  
 13 so long as there is a direct connection with the individual to a discussion of a topic of  
 14 widespread public interest.

15                 *Id.* The moving party has the initial burden of showing by a preponderance of the evidence that  
 16 the claim to be stricken is based on an action involving public participation and petition. *Id.*, at  
 17 1009. The act is to be construed liberally to effectuate the general purpose of protecting  
 18 participants in public controversies from an abusive use of the courts. *Id.* at 1110.

19                 In order to win on an anti-SLAPP motion, Allstate must establish that the SLAPP suit seeks  
 20 to chill its rights—that it was triggered by Allstate’s filing its lawsuit on an issue of public  
 21 concern. Allstate has not articulated any issue of public concern. Allstate’s claims arise from its  
 22 own overpayment on its insured’s claims, not from any larger issue of public concern. There is  
 23 no direct connection to an issue of public concern, Allstate is simply attempting to recover  
 24 money. There is also no first amendment issue in this case. Allstate’s motion to strike  
 McLaughlin’s counterclaims under the Washington Anti-SLAPP law is **DENIED**.

## 22                 B. 12(b)(6) Standard

23                 Dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) may be based on either the lack of a cognizable legal  
 24 theory or the absence of sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory. *Balistreri v.*

1 | *Pacifica Police Dep’t*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). A complaint must allege facts to state  
2 | a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949  
3 | (2009). A claim has “facial plausibility” when the party seeking relief “pleads factual content  
4 | that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the  
5 | misconduct alleged.” *Id.* Although the Court must accept as true a complaint’s well-pled facts,  
6 | conclusory allegations of law and unwarranted inferences will not defeat an otherwise proper  
7 | Rule 12(b)(6) motion. *Vasquez v. L.A. County*, 487 F.3d 1246, 1249 (9th Cir. 2007); *Sprewell v.*  
8 | *Golden State Warriors*, 266 F.3d 979, 988 (9th Cir. 2001). “[A] plaintiff’s obligation to provide  
9 | the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more than labels and conclusions, and a  
10 | formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. Factual allegations must be  
11 | enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550  
12 | U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations and footnote omitted). This requires a plaintiff to plead “more  
13 | than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949  
14 | (citing *Twombly*).

## **1. Conspiracy to Defraud & Extort**

16       McLaughlin alleges that Allstate (and the related Allstate entities) conspired to “defraud  
17 and extort” service providers doing work in exchange for liens on future payments. McLaughlin  
18 alleges that the goal of this alleged conspiracy was to drive such providers out of business.  
19 McLaughlin claims that this lawsuit is the vehicle Allstate used in an effort to accomplish this  
20 conspiracy. Allstate seeks dismissal of the conspiracy counterclaim, arguing that there is no  
21 evidence of any actionable overt act. It argues that filing a lawsuit is not unlawful as a matter of  
22 law, and that the identity(ies) of the co-conspirators is unclear.

1 A conspiracy is a combination of two or more persons contriving to commit a criminal or  
 2 unlawful act, or to commit a lawful act for criminal or unlawful purposes. *Adams v. King*  
 3 *County.*, 164 Wn.2d 640, 660, 192 P.3d 891 (2008). To establish a civil conspiracy, a plaintiff  
 4 must prove that: (1) two or more people combined to accomplish an unlawful purpose or  
 5 combined to accomplish a lawful purpose by unlawful means; and (2) the conspirators entered  
 6 into an agreement to accomplish the conspiracy. *Newton Ins. Agency & Brokerage, Inc. v.*  
 7 *Caledonian Ins. Grp., Inc.*, 114 Wn.App. 151, 160, 52 P.3d 30 (2002). Civil conspiracy is not, by  
 8 itself, an actionable claim. *W.G. Platts, Inc. v. Platts*, 73 Wn.2d 434, 439, 438 P.2d 867 (1968).  
 9 The plaintiff must be able to show an underlying actionable claim which was actually  
 10 accomplished by the conspiracy for the civil claim of conspiracy to be valid. *Id.* at 439. An act  
 11 consistent with a lawful and honest undertaking cannot form the basis of a civil conspiracy.  
 12 *Lewis Pac. Dairymen's Ass'n v. Turner*, 50 Wn.2d 762, 772, 314 P.2d 625 (1957).

13 Here, the only basis for the conspiracy is Allstate's filing this lawsuit. McLaughlin has  
 14 not cited any case (and the Court can find none) suggesting that filing a lawsuit can form the  
 15 "illegal act" element of a civil conspiracy claim. McLaughlin has not alleged (and apparently  
 16 cannot allege) a completed overt act. This claim is deficient as a matter of law. Allstate's motion  
 17 to dismiss for failure to state a claim for conspiracy to defraud and extort is **GRANTED**, and  
 18 that claim is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

## 19 2. Defamation

20 McLaughlin's defamation counterclaim alleges that Allstate's complaint falsely claims  
 21 that McLaughlin participated in a fraudulent scheme, and misrepresented information to Allstate.  
 22 Allstate argues that the allegedly defamatory statements were made in the course of this  
 23 litigation, and that they are privileged as a matter of law.

1       A defamation plaintiff must prove four elements: (1) falsity, (2) an unprivileged  
 2 communication, (3) fault, and (4) damages. *Paterson v. Little, Brown and Company*, 502 F.  
 3 Supp. 2d 1124, 1132 (W.D. Wash 2007). Statements are privileged if they are made: (1) in good  
 4 faith; (2) if there is an interest to be upheld; (3) if the statement was limited in its scope to this  
 5 purpose; (4) if the statement was made at a proper occasion; and (5) if publication was made in a  
 6 proper manner to the appropriate parties only. *See* 50 Am. Jur. 2d Libel and Slander § 25.

7       Statements made during the course of and relevant to judicial proceeding are absolutely  
 8 privileged. *Story v. Shelter Bay Co.*, 52 Wn.App. 334, 338, 760 P.2d 368 (1988). The judicial  
 9 proceeding privilege applies when authorities have the power to discipline with perjury sanctions  
 10 and strike impermissible statements from the record. *Id.* The privilege applies to in-court  
 11 statements and out-of-court statements that are pertinent or material to the redress or relief  
 12 sought. *Demopolis v. Peoples Nat. Bank of Washington*, 59 Wash. App. 105, 109, 796 P.2d 426,  
 13 429 (1990).

14       The statements forming the basis for McLaughlin's defamation claim originate in  
 15 Allstate's complaint. This Court retains the power to impose sanctions for perjury or Rule 11  
 16 violations and can strike statements if necessary. The litigation privilege applies to these  
 17 statements and they cannot form the basis for a defamation claim as matter of law. Allstate's  
 18 motion to dismiss the defamation counterclaim is **GRANTED**, and that claim is **DISMISSED**  
 19 with prejudice.

### 20                   **3. Violation of the Washington Consumer Protection Act**

21       McLaughlin asserts that, by filing this lawsuit and others like it, Allstate is engaging in an  
 22 unfair method of competition. He claims that the lawsuits are an attempt to drive providers (like  
 23 him) who do work for Allstate's insureds in exchange for liens on future recoveries, out of  
 24

1 business. Allstate responds that filing cannot be an unfair method of competition because a  
2 lawsuit is not a part of “in trade or commerce.”

3 To prevail in a private CPA action, a plaintiff must establish five elements: (1) an unfair  
4 or deceptive act or practice, (2) that occurs in trade or commerce, (3) a public interest, (4) injury  
5 to the plaintiff in his or her business or property, and (5) a causal link between the unfair or  
6 deceptive act and the injury suffered. *Indoor Billboard/Washington, Inc. v. Integra Telecom of*  
7 *Washington, Inc.*, 162 Wash. 2d 59, 73, 170 P.3d 10 (2007). If plaintiff cannot establish all five  
8 elements, his CPA claim must be dismissed. *Id.*

9 The terms “trade” and “commerce” include the sale of assets or services, and any  
10 commerce directly or indirectly affecting Washington citizens. *Hangman Ridge Training Stables,*  
11 *Inc. v. Safeco Title Ins. Co.* 105 Wn.2d 778, 785, 719 P.2d 531 (1986), citing RCW 19.86.010(2).  
12 Generally, once a lawsuit is filed, the matter is under the control of the court, and as such is a  
13 private dispute not occurring in trade or commerce. *Blake v. Fed. Way. Cycle Ctr.*, 40 Wash.App.  
14 302, 312, 698 P.2d 578, 584. However, if a party routinely files lawsuits as part of its business,  
15 its conduct, pleadings, affidavits and testimony within those lawsuits *are* within the sphere of  
16 trade or commerce. *Cruson v. A.A.A.A., Inc.*, 140 Wash. App. 1012 (2007).

17 McLaughlin’s CPA counterclaim is sufficiently plausible to survive a motion to dismiss.  
18 Insurance companies are frequently engaged in litigation as part of their business and therefore  
19 such litigation is within the sphere of trade or commerce. McLaughlin has adequately pled his  
20 CPA claim. The sufficiency of McLaughlin’s evidence may be tested in a Motion for summary  
21 judgment, or at trial. Allstate’s motion to dismiss the CPA counterclaim is **DENIED**.

22  
23  
24

#### **4. Tortious Interference**

2 McLaughlin's tortious interference counterclaim alleges Allstate's lawsuit intentionally  
3 caused the termination of his business expectancy (presumably by driving away clients or  
4 hindering referrals). He claims Allstate's ultimate object is to destroy the business of medical  
5 and legal service providers, including McLaughlin. Allstate seeks dismissal of this claim,  
6 arguing that any interference was privileged as a matter of law.

Under Washington law, a claim for tortious interference with a contractual relationship or business expectancy requires plaintiff prove five elements: (1) the existence of a valid contractual relationship or business expectancy; (2) that defendants had knowledge of that relationship; (3) an intentional interference inducing or causing a breach or termination of the relationship or expectancy; (4) that defendants interfered for an improper purpose or used improper means; and (5) damage. *Topline Equipment, Inc. v. Stan Witty Land, Inc.*, 31 Wn.App. 86, 92, 639 P.2d 825 (1982).

14 A person is not liable for interference with prospective economic advantage if the  
15 interference is privileged. *Cherberg v. Peoples Nat'l Bank*, 88 Wash.2d 595, 604-05, 564 P.2d  
16 1137 (1977). Statements privileged from defamation are also privileged under the law of  
17 interference with prospective economic advantage. *Stidham v. Department of Licensing*, 30  
18 Wash.App. 611, 615- 16, 637 P.2d 970 (1981). Exercising one's legal interest in good faith is not  
19 improper interference. *Tacoma Auto Mall, Inc. v. Nissan N. Am., Inc.*, 169 Wn.App. 111, 132-33,  
20 279 P.3d 487 (2012). A party is not guilty of tortious interference when (1) he has a legally  
21 protected interest, (2) which he in good faith asserts or threatens to protect, and (3) the threat is  
22 to protect the interest by appropriate means. *Quadra Enterprises, Inc. v. R.A. Hanson Co., Inc.*,  
23 35 Wash. App. 523, 527, 667 P.2d 1120, 1122 (1983).

1      McLaughlin's tortious interference claim is based solely on Allstate's lawsuit against him.

2      Allstate's allegations are privileged in the defamation context, and they are privileged in the  
3      tortious interference context.


4      McLaughlin's claim for tortious interference fails as a matter of law. Allstate's motion to  
5      dismiss the tortious interference counterclaim is **GRANTED**, and that claim is **DISMISSED**  
6      with prejudice.

7                          **IV. Conclusion**

8      • Allstate's anti-SLAPP motion to strike is **DENIED**.  
9      • Allstate's Motion to Dismiss McLaughlin's conspiracy to defraud and extort counterclaim  
10     is **GRANTED** and that claim is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.  
11     • Allstate's Motion to Dismiss McLaughlin's defamation counterclaim is **GRANTED** and  
12     that claim is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.  
13     • Allstate's Motion to Dismiss McLaughlin's Consumer Protection Act counterclaim is  
14     **DENIED**.  
15     • Allstate's Motion to Dismiss McLaughlin's tortious interference counterclaim is  
16     **GRANTED** and that claim is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

17     IT IS SO ORDERED.

18     Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2014.

19                            
20                          Ronald B. Leighton

21                          RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
22                          UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE